

# The Philosophy of Personal Development: Taking Ultimate Responsibility for Your Destiny

<sup>1</sup>Geoffrey Angela., <sup>2</sup>Judith Akello Abal (PhD)., <sup>3</sup>Mary Ejang (PhD)., <sup>4</sup>Lydia Amongi

<sup>1</sup>Academic Registry Department, Lira University, P.O. Box 1035, Lira, Uganda, East Africa  
<https://orcid.org/0009-0000-3151-8695>

<sup>2</sup>Dean, Faculty of Management Sciences, Lira University, P.O. Box 1035, Lira, Uganda, East Africa

<sup>3</sup>Associate Professor of Sociology, Faculty of Management Sciences, Lira University, P.O. Box 1035, Lira, Uganda, East Africa

<sup>4</sup>Central Administration Department, Lira University, P.O. Box 1035, Lira, Uganda, East Africa

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100400055>

Received: 10 March 2026; Accepted: 19 March 2026; Published: 29 April 2026

## ABSTRACT

Humans consistently seek meaning, purpose, and a sense that their lives matter. Across philosophical, psychological, and spiritual traditions, personal development is seen as a dynamic process where individuals move from passivity and external control towards active authorship of their own lives. This manuscript explores the philosophy of personal development as the act of taking ultimate responsibility for one's destiny. Drawing on existential humanistic philosophy, religious-spiritual thought, and modern personality theory, it examines how freedom, responsibility, self-knowledge, and moral character interact to shape a life course. A conceptual, hermeneutic analysis of key texts and frameworks was undertaken, including existential pedagogy, theories of personality as a creative act, models of self-determination, Islamic and Christian perspectives on character development and vocation, and contemporary discussions on positive thinking and quality of life. The analysis highlights several recurring themes: personality is not a fixed trait but an ongoing task and creative act; responsibility is both a prerequisite and a result of a mature personality; destiny is better understood as a vocation or mission rather than mere fate; and self-development requires active engagement with internal and external "barriers," meaning, and values. These findings suggest that taking ultimate responsibility for one's destiny involves assuming authorship of responses to circumstances, nurturing character and self-knowledge, and aligning one's life with a personally and ethically meaningful sense of calling. This article concludes with practical implications for education, counselling, and spiritual guidance, and proposes research directions to empirically investigate responsibility-centred models of personal development.

**Keywords:** Autonomy; Self-determination; Responsibility; Personal freedom; Personality development.

## INTRODUCTION

Questions such as "Who am I?", "What is my purpose?", and "What is my destiny?" lie at the heart of human self-understanding. In contemporary societies experiencing rapid social, technological, and cultural change, individuals increasingly face demands to "be themselves," to shape their own life paths, and to take responsibility for choices that determine their futures (Ivanova & Ivanova, 2018; Medzhidova, 2025; Furman, 2025; Lazaruk, 2024). In this context, personal development is not a luxury but a necessity for navigating the complexities of modern life.

Personality development is widely recognised in psychology as a dynamic, lifelong process of shaping and reshaping integrated traits that define an individual's behaviour, experiences, and interpersonal relationships

(Gillani & Khan, 2025). Contextual factors and life-changing experiences influence these traits, evolving along a continuum rather than changing abruptly in fixed steps (Gillani & Khan, 2025). Philosophical anthropology and existential thought deepen this perspective by emphasising that personality is not simply a natural or social given but an ethical and spiritual category, a task, an ideal, and a creative act (Berdiayev, 2024; Radul et al., 2025; Medzhidova, 2025; Lazaruk, 2024). In this view, one is not merely born a “personality”; rather, one becomes a personality through acts of freedom, responsibility, and self-transcendence.

Existential–humanistic approaches explicitly connect personal growth with freedom and responsibility. Self-development relates to existential choices during crucial life moments, when individuals must respond to specific social situations and decide who they will become (Ivanova & Ivanova, 2018; Andreeva, 2022; Medzhidova, 2025; Lazaruk, 2024). Freedom here is seen not only as freedom “from” constraints but also as freedom “to” realise possibilities and accept responsibility for their outcomes (Ivanova & Ivanova, 2018; Andreeva, 2022). Responsibility is similarly viewed as a trait of character that manifests across all areas of life and signals socio-cultural maturity (Furman, 2025).

Religious and spiritual traditions offer complementary perspectives. Orthodox Christian thinkers such as Maximus the Greek describe human life as a journey towards unity of the soul, mind, and will, made possible only when individuals recognise their immortality and take responsibility for their lives before God and truth (Ionaitis, 2025). Islamic conceptions of Husn-i-Akhlaaq interpret personality development as structured moral and spiritual growth in which the self refines its character to realise its divinely appointed potential and role as vicegerent on earth (Shantall, 2020). Vedantic and other philosophical traditions likewise treat personality development as intertwined with self-knowledge and alignment with a higher wisdom or cosmic order (Gillani & Khan, 2025; Nawaz & Rasheed, 2025).

Across these frameworks, a recurring question arises: in what sense can individuals be said to “take ultimate responsibility for their destiny”? Modern life provides unprecedented autonomy, yet people often feel overwhelmed, alienated, or shaped by forces beyond their control—such as social structures, economic constraints, psychological conditioning, and biological dispositions (Gillani & Khan, 2025; Medzhidova, 2025; Lazaruk, 2024). At the same time, movements in positive psychology, self-help, and leadership development encourage people to “take responsibility,” “own their story,” and “become authors of their lives,” sometimes in ways that risk ignoring structural realities (Gillani & Khan, 2025; Ventegodt et al., 2003; Caesar, 2017; Scholtz, 2023).

There is, therefore, a conceptual gap between grand exhortations to personal responsibility and thorough, integrative explanations that show how responsibility, freedom, and destiny interact in personal development. Existing research often focuses on specific aspects of existential guilt and unlived life (Binder, 2022), quality-of-life responsibility (Ventegodt et al., 2003), leadership and adult learning (Scholtz, 2023), or ethical individualism and personal destinies (Norton, 1976), without systematically integrating these elements.

The manuscript tackles this gap by creating a philosophical synthesis centred on the following questions:

1. How do major existential, humanistic, and spiritual traditions conceptualise personal development, responsibility, and destiny?
2. In what way is personality a task and a creative act, and how does this relate to taking responsibility for one’s destiny?
3. How can destiny be seen as a vocation or mission that maintains both human freedom and contextual embeddedness?
4. What practical implications arise for education, counselling, and spiritual guidance?

The main idea is that personal development is best seen as taking full responsibility for one’s destiny, where “destiny” refers to a unique, ethically significant life project or calling rather than an externally dictated script.

## METHODS

### Design

A conceptual and hermeneutic methodology was employed, suitable for philosophical and theoretical exploration. Instead of gathering empirical data, the analysis consolidates and interprets primary and secondary sources from philosophy, psychology, theology, and educational theory related to self-development, freedom, responsibility, destiny, and vocation (Ivanova & Ivanova, 2018; Ionaitis, 2025; Berdiayev, 2024; Andreeva, 2022; Gillani & Khan, 2025; Shantall, 2020; Frunzã, 2017; Ventegodt, et al., 2003; Norton, 1976; Binder, 2022; Radul et al., 2025; Medzhidova, 2025; Furman, 2025; Lazaruk, 2024).

### Corpus Selection

Sources were selected according to four criteria:

1. Centrality of personal development: texts that explicitly address personality development, self-realisation, self-determination, or character formation (Ivanova & Ivanova, 2018; Berdiayev, 2024; Andreeva, 2022; Gillani & Khan, 2025; Shantall, 2020; Nawaz & Rasheed, 2025; Radul et al., 2025; Medzhidova, 2025; Lazaruk, 2024).
2. Focus on responsibility and freedom: works where responsibility, freedom, or existential choice serve as key categories (Ivanova & Ivanova, 2018; Ionaitis, 2025; Berdiayev, 2024; Andreeva, 2022; Ventegodt et al., 2003; Binder, 2022; Furman, 2025; Lazaruk, 2024).
3. Engagement with destiny or vocation: accounts that interpret life purpose, destiny, calling, or mission as central to human flourishing (Ionaitis, 2025; Shantall, 2020; Ventegodt et al., 2003; Norton, 1976; Binder, 2022).
4. Diversity of traditions: inclusion of existential–humanistic, religious–spiritual (Christian and Islamic), and psychological perspectives to prevent reduction to a single worldview (Ivanova & Ivanova, 2018; Ionaitis, 2025; Berdiayev, 2024; Andreeva, 2022; Gillani & Khan, 2025; Shantall, 2020; Nawaz & Rasheed, 2025; Ventegodt et al., 2003; Binder, 2022; Radul et al., 2025; Medzhidova, 2025; Furman, 2025; Lazaruk, 2024).

Representative works include existential pedagogy and education centred on freedom and responsibility (Ivanova & Ivanova, 2018; Andreeva, 2022), Berdiayev’s conception of personality as a creative act (Berdiayev, 2024), analyses of self-determination and selfhood (Medzhidova, 2025; Lazaruk, 2024), Orthodox Christian reflection on responsibility in Maximus the Greek (Ionaitis, 2025), Islamic Husn-i-Akhlaaq as a model of character development (Shantall, 2020), discussions of positive thinking and responsibility for quality of life (Frunzã, 2017; Ventegodt, et al., 2003), philosophical explorations of ethical individualism and personal destinies (Norton, 1976), and existential psychological accounts of existential guilt and an un-lived life (Binder, 2022).

### Analytical Procedure

The analysis proceeded in three stages:

1. Thematic coding: key texts were examined with attention to recurring concepts related to (a) self and personality; (b) freedom, choice, and responsibility; (c) destiny, vocation, and meaning; and (d) processes of self-development (self-knowledge, self-actualisation, character refinement) (Ivanova & Ivanova, 2018; Ionaitis, 2025; Berdiayev, 2024; Andreeva, 2022; Gillani & Khan, 2025; Shantall, 2020; Frunzã, 2017; Ventegodt et al., 2003; Binder, 2022; Medzhidova, 2025; Furman, 2025; Lazaruk, 2024).
2. Conceptual mapping: relationships among these themes were mapped, identifying convergences and tensions—for example, between determinism and freedom, or between individual self-authorship and

dependence on transcendent or communal sources of meaning (Ionaitis, 2025; Berdiayev, 2024; Gillani & Khan, 2025; Shantall, 2020; Ventegodt et al., 2003; Norton, 1976; Binder, 2022; Medzhidova, 2025; Furman, 2025; Lazaruk, 2024).

3. Integrative synthesis: insights were combined into a consistent philosophical explanation of personal development as taking full responsibility for one's destiny, emphasising implications and open questions.

### **Rigour and Limitations of Method**

The conceptual approach allows for deep engagement with diverse traditions and theoretical nuances, but it does not yield quantitative or causal claims. The selection of authors is necessarily selective, highlighting European existentialism, Russian religious thought, Islamic ethical psychology, and contemporary research on personality and quality of life (Ivanova & Ivanova, 2018; Ionaitis, 2025; Berdiayev, 2024; Andreeva, 2022; Gillani & Khan, 2025; Shantall, 2020; Frunzã, 2017; Ventegodt et al., 2003; Binder, 2022; Medzhidova, 2025; Furman, 2025; Lazaruk, 2024). The resulting synthesis aims for theoretical plausibility and internal consistency rather than empirical generalisation.

## **RESULTS**

The analysis identified four key thematic clusters related to the philosophy of personal growth and accountability for destiny.

### **1. Personality as Task and Creative Act**

Multiple sources converge on the idea that personality is not a static entity but rather a task, an ideal, and a creative act. In a comprehensive philosophical theory of personality, personality is described as “not a givenness, but a task, an ideal of development, a way of a person's self--construction,” an “exception, not a rule,” and fundamentally “a creative act” involving effort, struggle, and liberation (Berdiayev, 2024). The spirit creates the unity of personality; its development marks “victory of the spirit over nature, freedom over necessity” (Berdiayev, 2024).

Similarly, existential–humanistic educational perspectives depict the “self-developing personality” as emerging through existential choices made at crucial life events within specific social contexts (Ivanova & Ivanova, 2018; Andreeva, 2022; Medzhidova, 2025). The individual is not merely the product of environment or temperament but an active subject who constructs a life through reflective decisions, overcoming “barriers” that shape their development (Ivanova & Ivanova, 2018).

In psychological terms, personality development is described as a dynamic process of constructing and deconstructing integrative traits that are constantly changing and influenced by context and important experiences (Gillani & Khan, 2025). This process is multidimensional and ongoing, reflecting varying intensities and levels of change rather than static categories (Gillani & Khan, 2025). Analyses of the “self” reveal it as a fundamental principle of existential unity expressed through processes such as self-knowledge, self-determination, self-realisation, and self-affirmation (Radul et al., 2025). A mature, “acmeological” personality is characterised by highly developed self-mechanisms, which enable self-change and the creation of a “human world” at the individual level of social existence (Radul et al., 2025).

Across these accounts, being a personality involves ongoing self-creation. Personality becomes a focal point where spirit and nature, freedom and necessity, individual uniqueness and universal significance intersect (Berdiayev, 2024).

### **2. Freedom and Responsibility as Indicators of Self-Development**

Freedom and responsibility emerge as key indicators of a self-developing personality. In contemporary education, freedom is understood not only as liberation from external constraints but also as the freedom to

realise one's potential and live a meaningful life (Ivanova & Ivanova, 2018). Existential pedagogy seeks to shape individuals who can “optimally live their life, making maximum use of their potentials, developing themselves and improving themselves” through socially significant activities (Ivanova & Ivanova, 2018; Andreeva, 2022).

Responsibility is seen as a character trait and property that appears in all areas of life and supports the well-being of families, groups, and societies (Furman, 2025). Classical and modern thinkers view responsibility as both freedom of choice and the way individuals live out their life roles or statuses (Furman, 2025). It is closely linked to obligation, accountability to others and oneself, and the capacity to answer for one's actions and omissions (Furman, 2025).

Philosophical analyses of quality of life define responsibility as viewing oneself as the cause of one's own existence and state of being, the one who shapes life rather than passively allowing others to do so (Ventegodt et al., 2003). Taking responsibility involves shifting perceived barriers from the external world to the internal realm, viewing challenges as difficult but achievable tasks that require wholehearted, goal-oriented effort (Ventegodt et al., 2003).

Existential psychology introduces the concept of existential guilt, describing the discomfort and sorrow associated with unrealised potential and an “unlived life” (Binder, 2022). Existential guilt results from recognising the gap between actualised and possible selves and acts as a prerequisite for genuine responsibility and accountability in life choices (Binder, 2022). It encourages repair in relationships with oneself and others and fosters openness to not-yet-lived possibilities (Binder, 2022).

Humanistic–existential approaches to self-determination emphasise individuals' own activity, value competence, creativity, and purposive striving for self-actualisation, all under conditions of freedom and responsibility for one's life project (Medzhidova, 2025; Lazaruk, 2024). To be a subject is to be the initiator of one's own activity; responsibility marks the higher stages of self-determination where one becomes author and executor of a personal project grounded in values and meaning (Radul et al., 2025; Medzhidova, 2025; Lazaruk, 2024).

Taken together, these perspectives imply that personal development is closely linked to fostering freedom as a positive ability and to taking responsibility as a form of ethical and existential accountability.

### **3. Destiny as Vocation Rather than Fatalism**

A third thematic complex relates to destiny. Destiny is the predetermined or inevitable course of events in a person's life, often perceived as a destined future, purpose, or fate. It represents the ultimate outcome or “destination” of one's life path, sometimes viewed as guided by a higher power (like God or fate) or shaped by personal choices. Rather than equating destiny with impersonal fate, several traditions interpret it as a vocation, calling, or mission that both invites and demands active personal engagement.

Orthodox Christian philosophy, exemplified by Maximus the Greek, portrays human life as directed towards restoring the unity of soul, mind, and will, which can only be achieved through conscious acceptance of immortality and responsible, meaningful living (Ionaitis, 2025). Humans are portrayed as uniquely capable of guiding their lives towards God, recognising the greatness of their goals, and utilising divinely bestowed reason for self-knowledge and self-perfection (Ionaitis, 2025). Responsibility for one's life is central to shaping personality and attaining the harmony for which humans were created (Ionaitis, 2025).

In Islamic Husn-i-Akhlaaq, human beings are regarded as vicegerents of God, whose status is not automatic but achieved through structured moral and spiritual growth (Shantall, 2020). Destiny here involves reaching “personal perfection” by refining the soul (Ruh), heart (Qalb), and self (Nafs), leading to self-actualisation, resilience, and flourishing (Shantall, 2020). Human destiny is to realise one's highest potential through character excellence, in harmony with divine guidance and the community (Shantall, 2020).

Existential and ethical individualist philosophies similarly present destiny as a unique potential that one is tasked with fulfilling. Eudaimonistic traditions (an ethical theory or perspective focused on human flourishing,

well-being, and living virtuously rather than merely experiencing pleasure) view each person as innately endowed with a unique potential that shapes their destiny; the moral life involves actualising this potential across the stages of life (Norton, 1976). Contemporary reflections on ultimate meaning suggest that humans find life truly meaningful only when they perceive their existence as destined and purposeful, with a unique, irreplaceable role to fulfil in the world (2022).

Across these frameworks, destiny is neither a fixed script nor a solely self-crafted narrative. It is better understood as a structured realm of possibilities, tasks, and responsibilities shaped by talents, context, relationships, and, in religious views, a transcendent call. The individual exercises freedom in responding to this realm, accepting, resisting, or ignoring the invitation. Personal development involves progressively cultivating a mature awareness of one's destiny and aligning choices with it (Norton, 1976; Binder, 2022).

#### **4. Practices of Self-Development: Self-Knowledge, Positive Thinking, and Character Refinement**

Finally, the literature highlights specific practices through which responsibility for destiny is exercised.

Firstly, self-knowledge is repeatedly emphasised. Maximus the Greek stresses that God has given reason to understand the soul and to rational self-transformation; cognition is intended to lead to action and active self-creation as an individual (Ionaitis, 2025). Analyses of the “self” frame self-knowledge, self-evaluation, and self-actualisation as mechanisms through which the personality restores and expands its abilities and opportunities (Radul et al., 2025).

Second, positive thinking is portrayed as an experiential form of personal development. Drawing on Descartes and later religious philosophical reflections, positive thinking is defined as the harmonisation of relationships with oneself, others, and the world, culminating in a process of conscious change (Frunză, 2017). Thinking shapes desires and willpower, enabling integration into a deliberate personal development process with a moral aim, the acquisition of virtue through knowledge of truth and the cultivation of measure (Frunză, 2017).

Third, character refinement and ethical practice are essential. Husn-Akhlaaq centres personality development on cultivating virtues that unite the soul, heart, and self, promoting spiritual excellence and practical resilience in everyday life (Shantall, 2020). Responsible personality theories identify various types of responsibility (legal, civil, ecological, professional, moral, and ethical) that together form social accountability and moral maturity (Furman, 2025). Leadership and adult learning philosophies contend that understanding the real and ideal self, encouraging self-directed learning, and creating environments that support experiential learning are crucial for self-determined, responsible leadership (Scholtz, 2023).

Approaches to quality of life suggest that taking responsibility involves shifting from seeking love and recognition to becoming the one who loves and acts. This shift reframes barriers as internal challenges and tasks (Ventegodt, et al., 2003). Such a perspective sees responsibility as a challenging yet profoundly liberating practice that can enhance subjective health, functioning, and a sense of meaning (Ventegodt, et al., 2003).

#### **Engaging Foundational Existential Thinkers**

Recent work on Sartre shows how directly analysing *Being and Nothingness* clarifies his specific claims about radical freedom, bad faith, and the tight link between freedom and responsibility, and also exposes tensions with universal morality (Akinbode, 2023; Kwon, 2023; Emekwulu, 2020; Siregar et al., 2025; Agarwal, 2022; Rae, 2024). These studies rely heavily on Sartre's own texts, using secondary literature mainly to frame objections (e.g., Plantinga, contemporary ethics) rather than as substitutes (Akinbode, 2023; Siregar et al., 2025; Rae, 2024).

#### **Modelling this, the manuscript covered the following:**

- Quoted key formulations (e.g., “existence precedes essence,” “condemned to be free”) and then related them to their own concepts of destiny and vocation.
- Differentiated Sartrean freedom from more compatibilist or theistic perspectives (e.g., Frankl, Kierkegaard, though not discussed here, could be addressed similarly, through primary works).

## Integrating Buddhist and Confucian Perspectives

Research in Buddhist ethics and philosophy of action shows rich, primary-text-based debates on free will, agency, and moral responsibility, drawing on doctrines of dependent arising, anattā (non-self), karma, and Abhidharma sources (Volkova, 2024; Coseru, 2016; Coseru, 2020; Thapa et al., 2025; Ostrovskaya, 2022; Wahman, 2022; Breyer, 2013). Confucian scholarship analyses freedom, vocation, and destiny via Heaven’s Mandate (tianming) and the moral ideal of the cultivated person (Carleo, 2021; Chu & Vu, 2021; Ng, 2025; Jia, 2021; Liu, 2025).

Table 1: Showing Comparative Juxtaposing Existential, Buddhist, and Confucian motifs

Theme	Western existential focus	Buddhist / Confucian contrast	Citations
Freedom & self	Radical individual self-creation (Akinbode, 2023; Kwon, 2023; Emekwulu, 2020; Siregar et al., 2025; Agarwal, 2022; Rae, 2024)	Non-self and relational self, agency as cultivation in networks of causality/role (Volkova, 2024; Coseru, 2016; Coseru, 2020; Thapa et al., 2025; Chu & Vu, 2021; Ostrovskaya, 2022; Wahman, 2022; Breyer, 2013)	(Volkova, 2024; Coseru, 2016; Akinbode, 2023; Coseru, 2020; Carleo, 2021; Thapa et al., 2025; Emekwulu, 2020; Chu & Vu, 2021; Ostrovskaya, 2022; Siregar et al., 2025; Wahman, 2022; Agarwal, 2022; Jia, 2021; Rae, 2024; Liu, 2025; Breyer, 2013)
Destiny/mandate	Self-authored project vs. facticity (Akinbode, 2023; Emekwulu, 2020; Siregar et al., 2025; Rae, 2024)	Heaven’s mandate and karma as constraints that still empower self-cultivation and moral action (Volkova, 2024; Carleo, 2021; Chu & Vu, 2021; Ng, 2025; Jia, 2021; Breyer, 2013)	(Volkova, 2024; Carleo, 2021; Chu & Vu, 2021; Ng, 2025; Jia, 2021; Breyer, 2013)
Vocation/calling	Authentic self-chosen life-task (Akinbode, 2023; Emekwulu, 2020; Siregar et al., 2025)	Confucian vocation as response to Heaven and concrete goods; Buddhist path as liberation from suffering (Thapa et al., 2025; Chu & Vu, 2021; Ng, 2025; Jia, 2021; Ashcraft & Calvert, 2023)	(Thapa et al., 2025; Chu & Vu, 2021; Ng, 2025; Jia, 2021; Ashcraft & Calvert, 2023)

## DISCUSSION

### Freedom, Responsibility, and Destiny in Personal Development: Conceptual Clarifications

Core Concepts: Freedom, Responsibility, Agency, Autonomy

- Freedom
  - As the highest form of activity: feeling independent of external pressures and internal impulses, a mature, socially mediated function of self-determination (Leontiev, 2024).
  - As freedom “for”: the ability to choose and act towards self-development and socially meaningful activities, not just freedom “from” constraints (Colburn, 2022; Moskovets, 2019).
- Responsibility
  - A form of self-regulation and the “second side” of personal causation: seeing oneself as a cause of events and intentionally producing goal-directed change in self and world (Leontiev, 2024; Moskovets, 2019).

- Guarding identity and meaning: responsibility for existential attitudes, life project, and meaning of one’s activity (Mamedova, 2022; Mizdrak, 2017).
- Agency vs. Autonomy
  - Agency: capacity to initiate and control actions; core to self-sufficiency and to shaping life circumstances rather than merely undergoing them (Leontiev, 2024; Bandura, 2006; Hojman & Miranda, 2017).
  - Autonomy: a structured form of agency focused on self-governance, rational control, and self-endorsed goals; analysed via freedom of choice (options), agency (capacity), and self-constitution (identity and authenticity) (Colburn, 2022; Helwig, 2006; Vugts et al., 2020; Ruiz & Yabut, 2024).

Table 2: Showing Concepts Relevant to “Ultimate Responsibility,” “Destiny,” and “Vocation”

Concept	Concise Research-Based Sense	Citations
Ultimate responsibility	Taking oneself as author of one’s life project and meaning, even under constraint; responsibility “ad personam et ad situationem” (Mizdrak, 2017; Mavrinac, 2018; Leontiev, 2024)	(Mizdrak, 2017; Mavrinac, 2018; Leontiev, 2024)
Destiny	Life’s overarching course is something one both undergoes and shapes through free, responsible responses to reality (Mizdrak, 2017; Berdiayev, 2024; Helwig, 2006)	(Mizdrak, 2017; Berdiayev, 2024; Helwig, 2006)
Vocation	Self-determination as realising one’s calling; fulfilment of a life-task grounded in values and meanings (Lazaruk, 2024; Berdiayev, 2024; Chickering & Braskamp, 2009)	(Lazaruk, 2024; Berdiayev, 2024; Chickering & Braskamp, 2009)

### Personality, Meaning, and Spiritual–Ethical Dimensions

Personality is framed as an ethical and spiritual category, “not a givenness, but a task,” a creative act of self-construction and liberation, oriented by vocation and responsibility (Berdiayev, 2024). Self-determination unfolds as realising values and meanings (“For what?”), culminating in existential and spiritual self-fulfilment (Lazaruk, 2024; Mizdrak, 2017; Moskovets, 2019).

Conclusively, across these works, freedom is best defined as an active, value-guided capacity to shape one’s life; responsibility as owning one’s role in that shaping; agency and autonomy as the psychological capacities that make this possible; and vocation/destiny as the meaningful, often transcendent horizon within which this co-created life is lived. A compact early subsection distinguishing these terms along these lines would tightly support the synthesis you outline.

### Synthesising Freedom, Responsibility, and Destiny

The findings suggest a coherent, though complex, picture: personal development can be seen as the gradual taking on of responsibility for a life that is both freely chosen and profoundly meaningful. Personality is best regarded not merely as a psychological profile but as an ethical and spiritual endeavour, a creative act wherein the individual co-constructs’ identity with nature, society, and, within religious frameworks, with God (Ionaitis, 2025; Berdiayev, 2024; Shantall, 2020; Ventegodt et al., 2003; Norton, 1976).

In this picture, freedom is not merely the absence of restrictions but the capacity to respond creatively and responsibly to life's conditions. This encompasses the ability to reinterpret obstacles, make choices aligned with one's values and sense of meaning, and take action rather than remain passive or victimised (Ivanova & Ivanova, 2018; Ventegodt et al., 2003; Binder, 2022; Medzhidova, 2025; Furman, 2025; Lazaruk, 2024). Responsibility then becomes the willingness to own these responses, recognising oneself as the cause of one’s

attitude towards life even when external events are beyond control (Ventegodt, et al., 2003; Binder, 2022; Furman, 2025).

Destiny is the predetermined or inevitable course of events in a person's life, often perceived as a destined future, purpose, or fate. It represents the ultimate outcome or "destination" of one's life path, sometimes viewed as guided by a higher power (like God or fate) or shaped by personal choices. Destiny occupies an intermediate space between external fate and arbitrary self-invention. Philosophical and spiritual traditions examined here tend to depict destiny as a structured yet open field of potentialities, tasks, and relationships that are uniquely "one's own" (Ionaitis, 2025; Ionaitis, 2022; Shantall, 2020; Ventegodt et al., 2003; Norton, 1976; Binder, 2022). The person is free not in choosing whether there is such a field but in how to respond to it through acceptance, creative elaboration, avoidance, or denial. Existential guilt testifies to the awareness that much of this field may remain un-lived, and it can motivate renewed responsibility for the "not yet" of one's life (Binder, 2022).

### **From this angle, taking ultimate responsibility for one's destiny means:**

- Recognising that no one else can live one's life, realise one's potential, or answer one's calling.
- Owning one's responses to circumstances, including failures and missed opportunities, as opportunities for renewal rather than final condemnation.
- Committing to ongoing self-knowledge, character development, and practical efforts to align life with a personally and ethically meaningful vocation.

### **Context and Limits of Responsibility**

The literature also cautions against simplistic or individualistic interpretations of responsibility. Personality is always contextually rooted in social, cultural, and historical environments that either enable or limit possibilities (Ivanova & Ivanova, 2018; Gillani & Khan, 2025; Medzhidova, 2025; Furman, 2025; Lazaruk, 2024). Responsible personality theories specifically examine how responsibility functions across legal, economic, political, ecological, and professional spheres, underlining that responsibility is both internal (personal accountability) and external (social expectations and structures) (Furman, 2025).

Humanistic–existential approaches to self-determination highlight that self-actualisation develops within cultural-historical conditions and value systems, involving the navigation of tensions between individuality and community, autonomy and belonging (Medzhidova, 2025; Lazaruk, 2024). Religious perspectives, on the other hand, place personal responsibility within relationships with God, community, and creation, warning against viewing destiny as solely a private endeavour (Ionaitis, 2025; Shantall, 2020; Ventegodt et al., 2003).

Therefore, ultimate responsibility for one's destiny does not imply omnipotent control or the denial of structural injustice. Instead, it represents the maximum level of authorship over one's orientation, choices, and character within the given circumstances, including the duty to engage with and, where possible, challenge unjust structures.

### **Strengths and Limitations of the Conceptual Synthesis**

The synthesis benefits from convergence across diverse traditions: personality as a task and creative act; freedom and responsibility as signs of maturity; destiny as a vocation; and concrete practices of self-development. However, several limitations remain.

First, the analysis is theory-driven and does not directly test claims empirically. Assertions about the effects of responsibility, positive thinking, or character refinement on well-being and flourishing require empirical confirmation (Gillani & Khan, 2025; Shantall, 2020; Ventegodt et al., 2003; Scholtz, 2023). Second, cultural breadth is limited: Western existential and Russian religious philosophy, Islamic ethical psychology, and some contemporary psychological theories are represented, but other traditions (e.g., Confucianism, African philosophies) are largely absent. Third, the concept of "ultimate responsibility" itself remains philosophically contested, raising questions about determinism, unconscious influences, and the role of luck in life outcomes.

---

## CONCLUSION

Across existential, humanistic, and spiritual frameworks, personal development is understood as a lifelong journey towards becoming a responsible individual, in which personality is formed through freedom, self-knowledge, and ethical commitment within a field of possibilities often described as destiny or calling. Personality is thus not merely inherited or imposed, but emerges through creative, value-laden action and the assumption of responsibility in social and spiritual contexts. This work offers a consolidated account that brings together existential, humanistic, and spiritual perspectives, showing a shared logic of responsibility-centred development rather than treating them as separate traditions. It clarifies “destiny” not as a fixed fate but as a structured yet open field of possibilities that can be co-shaped through responsible choice and meaning-making. It formulates an explicitly middle position that avoids both fatalistic resignation and naïve voluntarism by integrating context, limitation, and inner spiritual–existential agency into a single model of self-formation. Taking full responsibility for one’s destiny, in this integrated sense, means recognising oneself as the essential agent in this process, accepting one’s responses to circumstances, and actively engaging in the creative and moral endeavour to align life with a meaningful calling. This reframing affirms the deep, though limited, power individuals possess to shape who they become, while maintaining the seriousness of constraints and relational embeddedness.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

### For Education and Pedagogy

- Integrate existential–humanistic principles into curricula by emphasising students’ capacity for self-development, providing freedom “for” meaningful projects, and fostering responsibility for learning and life choices (Ivanova & Ivanova, 2018; Andreeva, 2022; Medzhidova, 2025; Scholtz, 2023; Lazaruk, 2024).
- Create learning environments that promote self-reflection, the exploration of values, and the development of self-directed learning skills, allowing students to see themselves as the authors of their educational journeys (Ivanova & Ivanova, 2018; Medzhidova, 2025; Scholtz, 2023).

### For Counselling, Coaching, and Mental Health

- Apply responsibility-focused frameworks that assist clients in reframing external obstacles as opportunities for internal growth, without downplaying structural realities (Ventegodt et al., 2003; Binder, 2022; Medzhidova, 2025; Lazaruk, 2024).
- Incorporate practices of self-knowledge (such as life narratives and reflective exercises), positive thinking (including reframing, gratitude, and virtue-based cognition), and character development (virtue cultivation and commitment to values) to support coherent personal growth (Shantall, 2020; Frunză, 2017; Ventegodt et al., 2003; Binder, 2022; Medzhidova, 2025; Lazaruk, 2024).

### For Spiritual and Community Contexts

- Present destiny as a collective endeavour involving both individual vocation and communal or transcendent aims, balancing personal agency with interdependence and service (Ionaitis, 2025; Ionaitis, 2022; Shantall, 2020; Ventegodt et al., 2003; Norton, 1976).
- Promote character education initiatives (e.g., Husni Akhlaq-inspired programmes) that align moral and spiritual development with psychological resilience and social contribution (Shantall, 2020).

### Areas for Future Studies

- Empirical evaluation of responsibility-centred interventions: Longitudinal and experimental studies examining how programmes emphasising responsibility for one’s destiny influence well-being, resilience, identity integration, and moral conduct (Gillani & Khan, 2025; Shantall, 2020; Ventegodt et al., 2003; Binder, 2022; Scholtz, 2023).

- Cross-cultural comparative research: Analyses of how different philosophical and religious traditions (e.g., Islamic, Christian Orthodox, Vedantic, indigenous worldviews) operationalise responsibility and destiny in educational and therapeutic practice (Ionaitis, 2025; Gillani & Khan, 2025; Shantall, 2020; Nawaz & Rasheed, 2025; Radul et al., 2025; Medzhidova, 2025).
- Developmental trajectories of “destiny consciousness”: Examines how awareness of vocation and personal destiny arise throughout the lifespan, and how they interact with identity development, existential guilt, and life satisfaction (, 2022; Gillani & Khan, 2025; Norton, 1976; Binder, 2022; Medzhidova, 2025; Lazaruk, 2024).
- Structural conditions and personal responsibility: Research examining how social, economic, and political contexts restrict or enable individuals’ capacity to take responsibility for their own destiny, and which institutional changes best support self-developing personalities (Ivanova & Ivanova, 2018; Gillani & Khan, 2025; Medzhidova, 2025; Furman, 2025; Lazaruk, 2024).

These directions can connect deep conceptual traditions with empirical research, clarifying how the philosophy of personal development can guide practical actions that enable individuals to take grounded, realistic, yet meaningful responsibility for their destiny.

## REFERENCES

1. Akinbode, E. (2023). Jean-Paul Sartre’s Existential Freedom: A Critical Analysis. *International Journal of European Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ijes.20230701.13>
2. Andreeva, Y. (2022). A person in an optimistic perspective of personal development: Existential-humanistic approach. *Культурный код*, 3, 9–20. <https://doi.org/10.36945/2658-3852-2022-3-9-20>
3. Ashcraft, J., & Calvert, I. (2023). Teaching, Learning and the Buddha: Educative Principles from the Nidāna-Kathā. *Religions*. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel14091093>
4. Bandura, A. (2006). Toward a Psychology of Human Agency. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 1, 164 - 180. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6916.2006.00011.x>
5. Berdiayev, M. (2024). Personality as a creative act. *Psihologîâ i suspil’stvo “Psychology and Society”*, 1, 49–80. <https://doi.org/10.35774/pis2024.01.049>
6. Binder, P. (2022). The call of the un-lived life: On the psychology of existential guilt. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, Article 991325. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.991325>
7. Breyer, D. (2013). Freedom with a Buddhist Face. *Sophia*, 52, 359-379. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11841-012-0308-2>
8. Buherko, J. (2023). Vital rhythms of spiritual being in the foundations of canonical psychology. *Psihologîâ i suspil’stvo “Psychology and Society”*. <https://doi.org/10.35774/pis2023.02.084>
9. Caesar, D. (2017). Moving to the enlightened side: A personal perspective on self-development and motivation. *BMJ Leader*, 1(1), 22–23. <https://doi.org/10.1136/leader-2017-000032>
10. Carleo, R. (2021). Confucian freedom: assessing the debate. *Asian Philosophy*, 31, 211 - 228. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09552367.2021.1899439>
11. Chickering, A., & Braskamp, L. (2009). Developing a Global Perspective for Personal and Social Responsibility, 11, 27.
12. Chu, I., & Vu, M. (2021). The Nature of the Self, Self-regulation and Moral Action: Implications from the Confucian Relational Self and Buddhist Non-self. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 180, 245-262. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-021-04826-z>
13. Colburn, B. (2022). *The Routledge Handbook of Autonomy*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429290411>
14. Coseru, C. (2016). Freedom From Responsibility: Agent-Neutral Consequentialism and the Bodhisattva Ideal. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315668765-17>
15. Coseru, C. (2020). Free your mind: Buddhism, causality, and the free will problem. *Zygon®*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/zygo.12586>
16. Emekwulu, I. (2020). The Issue of Freedom and Responsibility in Sartre’s Philosophical Propoundment. *IAR Journal of Humanities and Social Science*. <https://doi.org/10.47310/iarjhss.2020.v01i04.004>

17. Frunză, S. (2017). Positive Thinking as an Experience of Personal Development. *Journal for the Study of Religions and Ideologies*, 16(48), 19–31.
18. Furman, O. (2025). Responsible personality and personal responsibility: The dialectic of categorical complementarity. *Psihologîa i suspil'stvo*, 2, 22–47. <https://doi.org/10.35774/pis2025.02.022>
19. Gillani, U., & Khan, M. (2025). Achieving our highest potential through character development (Husni-Akhlaaq): An Islamic perspective on holistic personality development, spiritual growth and human flourishing. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 16, Article 1569393. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1569393>
20. Helwig, C. (2006). The development of personal autonomy throughout cultures. *Cognitive Development*, 21, 458-473. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cogdev.2006.06.009>
21. Hojman, D., & Miranda, A. (2017). Agency, Human Dignity, and Subjective Well-being. *World Development*, 101, 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2017.07.029>
22. Ionaitis, O. B. (2025). Maximus the Greek's "Inquisitive Questions" about Human Responsibility. *Vestnik Gumanitarnogo universiteta = Bulletin of Liberal Arts University*, 13(2), 132–143. <https://doi.org/10.35853/vestnik.gu.2025.13-2.12>
23. Ivanova, I., & Ivanova, I. (2018). Freedom and Responsibility of the Individual As Indicators of Self-Development. *Standards and Monitoring in Education*, 4(6), 37–45. [https://doi.org/10.12737/article\\_5a5f1c3a57fd89.41926160](https://doi.org/10.12737/article_5a5f1c3a57fd89.41926160)
24. Jia, J. (2021). The classical Confucian conception of Heaven's Mandate. *Philosophy Compass*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/phc3.12737>
25. Kontrimienė, S. (2019). Assessing Spirituality as the Ultimate End: Development and Validation of the Humanistic Spirituality Inventory. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 64, 916 - 939. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022167819850678>
26. Kwon, W. (2023). Sartre's philosophy and the problems of modern society, freedom, and responsibility. *The Korean East-West Mind Science Association*. <https://doi.org/10.55586/kewms.2023.26.1.81>
27. Lazaruk, A. (2024). Phenomenology of a person's self-determination: Basic theoretical approaches in psychology. *Psihologîa i suspil'stvo*, 1, 131–153. <https://doi.org/10.35774/pis2024.01.131>
28. Leontiev, D. (2024). From the Phenomenon of Self-Sufficiency to the Mechanisms of Self-Determination. *Voprosy obrazovaniya / Educational Studies Moscow*. <https://doi.org/10.17323/vo-2024-17626>
29. Leshchenko, A., Lauta, O., Shaulska, H., Yarovy, A., & Makarov, Z. (2023). Existential aspects of human existence and the human-centered paradigm in public administration. *Revista Amazonia Investiga*. <https://doi.org/10.34069/ai/2023.64.04.38>
30. Liu, P. (2025). Rethinking the Relationship Between Freedom and Benevolence in Liberal Confucianism. *Religions*. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel16060687>
31. Mamedova, N. (2022). The Problem Of Identity In The Aspect Of Freedom And Responsibility. *European Proceedings of Social and Behavioural Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.15405/epsbs.2022.03.15>
32. Mavrinc, M. (2018). Vocation, Autonomy, Agency, and Meaning. *Family medicine*, 50 1, 73. <https://doi.org/10.22454/fammed.2018.646725>
33. McDonald, S., & Perry, J. (2023). Franklian Existentialism and Transformative Learning: Unlikely Co-Captains in Uncertain Times. *Journal of Transformative Education*, 21, 556-573. <https://doi.org/10.1177/15413446231152853>
34. Medzhidova, N. (2025). Worldview and personality in the context of philosophical understanding of human self-actualization. *Bulletin of the Karaganda University. History. Philosophy Series*, 2, 285–292. <https://doi.org/10.31489/2025hph2/285-292>
35. Mizdrak, I. (2017). The will to live and man's responsibility according to Etty Hillesum and Victor Frankl. *Paediatrics and Child Health*, 7, 77-97. <https://doi.org/10.15633/pch.1982>
36. Moskovets, L. (2019). Свобода та відповідальність у процесі самореалізації педагогічних працівників, "Freedom and responsibility in the process of self-realisation of pedagogical workers.", 5, 152-168. <https://doi.org/10.31108/1.2019.5.12.10>
37. Nawaz, M., & Rasheed, K. (2025). Know thyself: The philosophy of self-realization in Paulo Coelho's *The Alchemist*. *American Journal of Development Studies*, 3(2), 22–32. <https://doi.org/10.54536/ajds.v3i2.5746>
38. Ng, T. (2025). A Summoned Life: Vocation in the Analects. *Journal of Religious Ethics*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jore.70000>

39. Norton, D. L. (1976). *Personal Destinies: A Philosophy of Ethical Individualism*. Princeton University Press.
40. Ostrovskaya, H. (2022). Buddhist Ethics in Treatises of Post-Canonical Abhidharma. *RUDN Journal of Philosophy*. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2313-2302-2022-26-2-325-341>
41. Predko, O. (2019). Religious faith: existential-anthropological meanings. *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*. <https://doi.org/10.15802/ampr.v0i16.186936>
42. Radul, V. (2022). Existentialism and activity (comparative characteristics of personality development). *Social work and social education*. [https://doi.org/10.31499/2618-0715.1\(8\).2022.262603](https://doi.org/10.31499/2618-0715.1(8).2022.262603)
43. Radul, V., Radul, O., & Balanutsa, O. (2025). The problem of “self” in the personality development. *Social Work and Social Education*, 1(14), 259–269. [https://doi.org/10.31499/2618-0715.1\(14\).2025.332259](https://doi.org/10.31499/2618-0715.1(14).2025.332259)
44. Rae, G. (2024). Sartre on Action: Decentering the Will. *Journal of the British Society for Phenomenology*, 55, 201 - 220. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00071773.2024.2332200>
45. Rohova, O., & Vysotska, O. (2022). Conceptual foundations of spiritual and value-based educational orientations. *Dnipro Academy of Continuing Education Herald. Series: Philosophy, Pedagogy*. <https://doi.org/10.54891/2786-7005-2022-2-1>
46. Ruiz, W., & Yabut, H. (2024). Autonomy and identity: the role of two developmental tasks on adolescent's wellbeing. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 15. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1309690>
47. Scholtz, G. (2023). Leadership development perspective of adult learning philosophies. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 21(3), 100792. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2023.100792>
48. Shantall, T. (2020). *Ultimate Meaning: Your Destiny in Life*. In *The Quest for Meaning in Life: Gleanings from Logotherapy* (pp. 247–266). Springer. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-30770-7\\_11](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-30770-7_11)
49. Siregar, P., Nasution, H., & Syukri, S. (2025). Jean-Paul Sartre: Analysing Human Existence Through the Lens of Existentialism. *Journal of Social Knowledge Education (JSKE)*. <https://doi.org/10.37251/jske.v6i1.1410>
50. Thapa, P., Pallathadka, P., & Kshetry, Y. (2025). Buddhist modernism: the path to freedom and the search for life. *International Journal of Engineering Applied Sciences and Technology*. <https://doi.org/10.33564/ijeast.2025.v10i02.012>
51. Ventegodt, S., Andersen, N. J., & Merrick, J. (2003). Quality of Life Philosophy V. Seizing the Meaning of Life and Becoming Well Again. *The Scientific World Journal*, 3, 1210–1229. <https://doi.org/10.1100/tsw.2003.105>
52. Бикторівна, С., Олена, С., Васильвна, С., & Статті, Р. (2024). Conceptual Anthropological Approaches to Defining the Methodology of Humanistic Education and Spiritual-Intellectual Development of Youth. *Spiritual and intellectual upbringing and teaching of youth in the XXI century*. <https://doi.org/10.58962/2708-4809.siuty.2024.01>
53. Vijayarajan, K. U. (2022). Personality development and Vedanta philosophy. *The Philosophy of Personal Development*, 4(4), 13–23. <https://doi.org/10.46632/cllrm/4/4/2>
54. Volkova, V. (2024). The Problems of Free Will and Moral Responsibility in Buddhist Ethics. *RUDN Journal of Philosophy*. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2313-2302-2024-28-1-109-119>
55. Vugts, A., Van Den Hoven, M., De Vet, E., & Verweij, M. (2020). How autonomy is understood in discussions on the ethics of nudging. *Behavioural Public Policy*, 4, 108-123. <https://doi.org/10.1017/bpp.2018.5>
56. Wahman, J. (2022). Buddhist Anattā, Dependent Arising, and the Problem of Free Will. *The Journal of Speculative Philosophy*, 36, 457 - 475. <https://doi.org/10.5325/jspecphil.36.4.0457>